

Contrastive Study of the WISH Construction in English, Japanese and Korean

Eiko TAKEDA*

1. Introduction

Languages have a construction which expresses the speaker's wishes and hopes (the WISH construction hereafter). In the case of English it takes the form of a conditional structure "wish P" as shown in (1a) below in stead of a normal conditional expressed as "if P, then Q." Japanese expresses speaker's attitude in the form of a conditional pattern similar to the English case, as shown in (1b) below. Also well-known to learners of Korean is the fact that Korean has the similar structure with that of Japanese as shown in (1c) below:

(1) [E] a . I wish [Mary came now].

[J] b . [Mary-ga kure-ba] yoi-noni / ii-N-dakedo.

Mary-NOM come-Present-if good-Present though.

[K] c . Cho-nun [Meri-ga o-myen] heyo.

I-Top Mary-NOM come-Present-if wish-Present

[E], [J] and [K] at the initial position of the sentences in (1) represent English, Japanese and Korean, respectively. However, it is to be noted that English WISH construction such as in (1a) is assumed to represent the counterfactual meaning. Therefore (1a) entails that the speaker believes that Mary is not coming. However, we will show that it is not always the case with the WISH construction like (1b) and (1c) in Japanese and Korean. (1b) and (1c) imply speaker's wish (i.e. *yoi-noni* in (1b) and *heyo*⁽¹⁾ in (1c) fall on *wish* in English). So they do not necessarily imply that the wisher believes that Mary is not coming. We must also note that tenses in complement clauses, which are in brackets, are different between English on the one hand and Korean and Japanese on the other hand. In (1a) the tense in the embedded clause in English is the Past⁽²⁾, but in (1b) and (1c), the tenses are the Present.

The primary concern of this paper is to clarify the contrastive characteristics of the WISH construction in English, Japanese and Korean found in examples like (1).

In this paper we will pay special attention to the following three points. First, what kind of tenses do verbal morphologies in English, Japanese and Korean represent? Second, what kind of implicational differences are there between English on the one hand and Japanese and Korean

* The writer is a part time teacher at Nagoya Women's University.

on the other hand? Third, where does the counterfactual reading come from?

The paper is organized as follows: Section 2.1 is a brief explanation of the WISH construction in English, Japanese and Korean, and 2.2 examines linguistic behaviors in each language. Section 3 is devoted to the discussion of why the contrast among them arises. Section 4 concludes this paper.

2. Data of the WISH construction

2.1 Preliminary

In this section, we will exemplify an array of data in the three languages. However, before we proceed, we need to explain the forms of the WISH constructions in each language.

Usually conditionals are expressed as “if P (then Q ”, but in the case of English WISH construction, it has the pattern of “wish / hope P ” as displayed in (1a). Japanese WISH construction is also expressed in a conditional form. In fact, there are several conditional patterns in Japanese, e.g., “ P tara Q ”, “ P nara Q ”, “ P to Q ”, “ P ba Q ”, etc., and they are used as variations of the WISH construction. In Korean, the WISH construction is expressed as “ P myen , (then) Q ” (= P if , (then) Q), which falls on normal conditional in Korean. We display them all together below :

(2) Patterns of the WISH construction

a . [E] wish / hope P

b . [J] P { tara / to / mo / ba } Q

c . [K] P myen , (then) Q

But how do we express the logical meaning found in (2)? Luckily there is an insightful argument in Akatsuka (1992: 4). In the article about Japanese Modals she argues that the WISH construction has the surface realization of the logical structure as shown below :

(3) IF p , q where q is the speaker's evaluative judgment GOOD / BAD,

toward the realization of p .

(Akatsuka 1992 : 4)

She claims that (3) is a grammaticalization of the speaker's attitude , “ I WANT IT TO HAPPEN / NOT TO HAPPEN. ” The abstract meanings , “ GOOD ” and “ BAD ” represent the emotion-loaded lexical items below, and they are lexicalized appropriately, depending on discourse contexts :

(4) GOOD (ii, ureshii, yoroshii, daizyobu, etc .)

good, happy, fine, all right, etc.

BAD (ikenai, damedai, iyada, zannenda, etc .)

no good, no good, dislike, sorry, etc .

(Ibid .)

Following her argument, we assume that the WISH construction is the expression of speaker's attitude , “ I WANT IT TO HAPPEN/ NOT TO HAPPEN. ” It is to be noted that in both Japanese and Korean, the Q is a lexical item that corresponds to the English wish / hope⁽³⁾ and it can be an adjective phrase (AP) and VP in both languages. As we go along, we will give more information when necessary.

2.2 Linguistic behaviors in English, Japanese and Korean

First we pick up cases where the tense of the Q is the Present in 2.2.1 , and then we

move to cases of the Past in 2.2.2. We start from English and then go to Japanese and move on to Korean.

2.2.1 Present tense in English and Japanese

In English, as we have mentioned before, a speaker's wish/hope is expressed by the above "wish *P*", but the construction has the connotation that the *P* does not hold.

See the following, where verbal morphologies in the *P* are underlined, and cases shown in Roman small letters like (i) and (ii) represent the implication, simply for convenience:

(5) [E] a. I wish Mary came to the party(*then).

i) Speaker regrets that Mary is not coming to the party.

b. I wish Mary had come to the party(*now). (Jang and Lee 1999 : 3)

i) Speaker regrets that Mary did not come to the party.

c. I wish this child were a boy. (based on Akatsuka 1985 : 627)

i) Speaker regrets that her child is a girl.

As Jang and Lee(1999 : 3) points out, (5a) is a present counterfactual, and (5b) is a past counterfactual construction, for the former is incompatible with the time adverbial *then*, and the latter is incompatible with the time adverbial *now*, respectively. Therefore, the speaker in (5a) regrets that Mary is not coming to the party as shown in (5a. i), and the speaker in (5b) regrets that Mary did not come to the party as shown in (5b. i). It is the same with (5c). The speaker regrets that her child is a girl as shown in (5c. i).

Now we turn to the behavior of Japanese WISH construction. In Japanese the WISH construction has the pattern of $P\{ tara / nara / ba \} Q$, (2b). *Tara / nara / ba* are clause connecting particles carrying conditional meaning (Kuno 1973). The *Q* is a lexical item that corresponds to the English "wish," and can be an AP. We pick up examples where *yoi / ii* (= "good") function as predicates in the *Q*. As its variation, we use *ii-N-dakedo*, meaning "good though". Some might suggest that "...*to omou*" and "...*to negau*" also correspond to the *Q*. The *omou* and *negau* are verbs whose English implication are "hope" and "wish", respectively. But when they are led by a complementizer *to* corresponding to "that", they follow the string "...*nara yoi noni*", and derive "...*nara yoi noni to omou*". However, the resulting form has no extra meaning, and in terms of Erteschik (1977), they are not the dominant part in the derived form. Thus as they are just redundant in semantic connotation, we will just do without them. In the following examples, the part which falls on the *P nara* is in brackets and verbal morphologies in the *P* are underlined and we give the literal meaning by a mark "lit.", all for convenience. Cases (a) and (b) show the sentences where the tenses of the verbal morphology are the Present and the Past, respectively.

(6) [J] a. [Mary-mo party-ni isshoni ike-ba] yoi-noni / ii-N-dakedo
 Mary-NOM-also party-to together go-Present-if good-Present-though

lit. If Mary could go together, it would be good.

If Mary can go together, it will be good.

i) Speaker is not sure of Mary's attendance at the party.

b . [Mary-mo party-ni isshoni itta-ra] yoi-noni/ii-N-dakedo.
 Mary-NOM-also party-to together go-Past-if good-Present-though

lit. I wish Mary could go together.

i) Speaker is not sure of Mary's attendance at the party.

According to Akatsuka(1985:627), many East Asian languages including Japanese and Korean have no subjunctive mood. So indicative mood is used there. First we notice that the temporal morphologies are different between(6a)and(6b),but in both cases they share the same implication that the speaker is not sure of Mary's attendance to the party as shown in(6a.i)and(6b.i).They are not counterfactual, but are simply the expression of the speaker's attitude "I WANT IT TO HAPPEN/NOT TO HAPPEN" in terms of Akatsuka(1992:4). So far we can say that the time difference in the *P* has nothing to do with the counterfactuality. Well then, does it mean that Japanese WISH construction has no counterfactuality? Before giving our conclusion let's check a few complicated examples, which require some contextual dependency.

(7) [J] a . [Kono-ko ga otoko-nara] yoi-noni.
 This-child-NOM a boy-be-Present-if good though

lit. I wish this child is a boy .

(based on Akatsuka 1985:627)

i) Speaker is not sure whether the coming child is a boy or not.

ii) Speaker regrets that this child is not a boy.

b . Kono-ko ga otoko-dat-tara yoi-noni.
 This-child-NOM a boy-be-Past-if wish-Present.

lit. I wish this child is a boy.

i) Speaker is not sure whether the coming child is a boy or not.

ii) Speaker regrets that the child is not a boy.

As shown above ,(7a, b)have two connotations. If the child has already been born, the speaker knows its sex. Therefore (7a, b)imply that the speaker regrets that her child is a girl as shown in(ii)in(7a, b). But if the pregnant woman does not know the sex of a coming child, then(7a, b)express her desire that she wants to have a boy as shown in(i)in(7a, b). So it follows that the counterfactuality of(7)is context dependent regardless of the tenses in the *P*.

Let's compare the difference between English and Japanese.

First, we note that there is a difference in temporal morphology in the *P* between the two languages. The morphological features on predicates in the *P* express the time which is re-

ferred to. We call it Event time⁽⁴⁾ in the sense of Machida(1989). The Event in the broad sense means states, movement, changes etc. that sentences can denote. In English the verbal morphology can be the Past and the Pluperfect and the Event time is the Present and the Past, respectively, as shown in(5a, b). In Japanese, on the other hand, the verbal morphology is either the Present or the Past, and the Event time is either the Future or Present as shown in(6 a, b). Also to be noticed is the implicational difference between the two languages. Namely the WISH construction in English implies counterfactuality, but it is not always the case with Japanese. In case of Japanese, counterfactuality is contextual. If the Event time is the Future, no counterfactuality is implied, but if it is the Present, then counterfactuality arises. The difference is summarized in(8):

(8) English and Japanese when the tense of the Q is the Present

language	WISH construction	morphologies in the <i>P</i>	Event time in the <i>P</i>	counterfactual
English	wish <i>P</i>	V-past	present	yes
		had V-en	past	
Japanese	<i>P</i> nara <i>Q</i>	V-present	future	no
		V-past	present	yes

where *P* nara *Q* represents other forms in(2b), and "future" corresponds to "no" and "present" corresponds to "yes".

2.1.2 Present tense in English and Korean

Now we turn to the behavior of Korean. Structurewise, it is quite similar to that of Japanese. In stead of *P* { *nara* / *tara* / *ba* } *Q*, it has the pattern of *P myen*, *Q*.

In Korean, *ha-ta*⁽⁵⁾ and *cho-kyess-ta* (the Present of *cho-ta*) are typical predicates⁽⁶⁾ in the *Q*. Lexically, *ha-ta* is a verb whose English translation is "do", and *cho-ta* is an AP whose English translation is "good". But when they follow the *P myen*, they constitute the WISH construction in Korean. In the examples that follow, as in case of Japanese, the *P myen* is in brackets, and cases(a) and (b) represent the examples where the tense of the verbal morphology in the *P* is the Present and Past, respectively. The following is the exact counterpart of Japanese example(6) above.

(9) [K] a . Na-nun [Meri-ga phati-ey o-myen] hayo.
 I-Top Mary-NOM party-to come-Present-if wish-Present-Ind

lit. I wish Mary would come to the party.

i) Speaker is not sure of Mary's attendance to the party.

b . Na-nun [Meri-ga phati-ey wa-ss-umyen] hayo.
 I-Top Mary-NOM party-to come-Past-if wish-Present-Ind

(Jang and Lee 1999 : 3)

lit. I wish Mary had come to the party.

i) Speaker is not sure of Mary's attendance to the party.

As Akatsuka(1985 : 627)points out, Korean has no subjunctive mood. Resultantly indicative mood is used. A glance at the data shows that the word order is identical with that of Japanese. The data bear striking similarity with that of Japanese. First, we see that the speaker is not sure of Mary's attendance to the party regardless of time difference, the Present and the Past, as shown in(i)in(9a, b). Secondary, they are not counterfactual, but are the expression of speaker's attitude, " I WANT IT TO HAPPEN/NOT TO HAPPEN " in terms of Akatsuka (1992 : 4). Next we see a case where an AP, *cho-ta*, appears in the *Q* :

- (10) [K] a . Na-nun [Meri-do phati-ey kachi ka-myen] cho-kyess-oyo.
 I-Top Mary-NOM-also party-to together go-Present-if wish-Present-Ind

lit. It would be nice if Mary could go to the party together.

i) Speaker is not sure of Mary's attendance to the party.

- b . Na-nun [Meri-do phati-ey kachi ka-ssu-myen] cho-kyess-oyo.
 I-Top Mary-NOM-also party-to together go-Past-if wish-Present-Ind

lit. It would be nice if Mary could have gone to the party together. '

i) Speaker is not sure of Mary's attendance to the party⁽⁷⁾.

It is to be noted that *myen cho-kye-ta* can follow the basic form or the past form of the verbs, APs or nouns(NPs). In conversation, using the past form is natural even if the meaning of the sentence does not express the situation of the Past tense⁽⁸⁾. In(10), too, the exact observation is obtained with that of(9), that is, no time difference and no counterfactuality.

Lastly, we pick up the Korean counterpart of(7)as shown below :

- (11) [K] a . Na-nun [i-ai-ga adul-i-myen] hayo / cho-kyess-oyo.
 I-Top this child-NOM a boy be-Present-if wish-Present-Ind

lit. If this child is a boy, I will be happy.

 If this child were a boy, I would be happy.

i) Speaker does not know the sex of her coming child yet.

ii) Speaker regrets that her baby is a girl.

- b . Na-nun [i-ai-ga adul-yetsu-myen] hayo / cho-kyess-oyo.
 I-Top this child-NOM a boy be-Past-if wish-Present-Ind

i) Speaker does not know the sex of her coming child yet.

ii) Speaker regrets that her baby is a girl.

In(11a, b),the identical result with that of Japanese(7a, b)is obtained. First, time difference in the *P* does not affect the implication of sentences. Additionally(11)has two connotations just

like the Japanese cases. If the child has already been born, the speaker knows its sex. Therefore (11a, b) imply the speaker's regret that her child is a girl as shown in (ii) in (11a, b). But if the pregnant woman does not know the sex of a coming child as shown in (i), then (11a, b) are the expression of her desire that she wants to have a baby boy. So it follows that the counterfactuality of (11) is context dependent, and has nothing to do with temporal difference on verbal morphology as in English.

Let us sum up pieces of observed phenomena above in (12):

- (12) Korean when the tense in the *Q* is Present

language	WISH construction	morphologies in the <i>P</i>	Event time	counterfactual
Korean	<i>P myen Q</i>	...V-present...	future	no
		..V-past...	present	yes

(12) shows that difference in temporal morphology in the *P* makes no difference with respect to implication of sentences. It is the Event time that brings about the implicational difference. Note when the Event time is the Future, no counterfactuality is involved as indicated by *no*. But if the Event time is the Present, then the speaker's desire is counterfactual. Hence comes counterfactuality. Therefore, it follows that the counterfactuality depends on context. Notice (12) is identical with that of Japanese.

Now we realize that English WISH construction makes a clear-cut contrast with those of Korean and Japanese in two points: one is tense difference shown on verbal and adjectival morphologies, and the other is counterfactuality of the *P*, which are the characteristics of English. In case of Korean and Japanese, counterfactuality arises only when the Event time is the Present.

For ease of comparison, we show the characteristics of the three languages in (13)

- (13) Comparison of English, Japanese and Korean when the tense in the *Q* is Present

language	WISH construction	Morphologies in the <i>P</i>	Event time in the <i>P</i>	counterfactual
English	wish <i>P</i>	*V-present		yes
		V-past	present	
		had V-en	past	
Japanese	<i>P nara Q</i>	V-present	future	no
		V-past	present	yes
Korean	<i>P myen Q</i>	V-present	future	no
		V-past	present	yes

where * denotes the mark of ungrammaticality.

2.2 Past tense in English, Japanese and Korean

Now we turn to cases where the tense of the *Q* is given in the Past.

First we check data in English, and then we turn to Japanese and Korean data.

- (14) [E] a. I wished I knew Chinese. (Egawa 1977: 256)

i) Speaker regretted that he did not know Chinese.

b . I wished I hadn't said that.

i) Speaker regretted that he had said that.

(14a, b)fall on cases where the tense in the *P* is the Past and the Pluperfect, respectively. As the Event time is the Past (14a, b)express counterfactuality of the past fact. The speaker in(14 a)regretted that(s)he did not know Chinese, and the speaker in(14b)regretted that(s)he had said that. So the conclusion follows that English WISH is counterfactual irrespective of the tenses of the main predicate.

Now we turn to Japanese. See(15)and(16)below comparing them with(6)and(7) , respectively, where the tenses of the main predicate are the Present :

- (15) [J] a . [Mary-mo party-ni isshoni yuke-ba]
 Mary-NOM-also party-to together go-Present-if
 yokatta-noni / yokatta-N-dakedo.
 good though(= wish-Past)

lit. " If Mary, too, could go together, it would have been good. "

i) Speaker regretted that Mary did not go to the party.

b . [Mary-mo party-ni isshoni itta-ra] yokatta-noni / yokatta-N-dakedo.
 go-Past-if

lit. " If Mary, too, could go together, it would have been good. "

i) Speaker regretted that Mary did not go to the party.

- (16) [J] a . [Kono-ko ga otoko-nara] yokatta-noni / yokkata-N-dakedo.
 This-child-NOM a boy be-Present-if good though(= wish-Past)

lit. " If this child were a boy, it would have been good. "

i) Speaker regretted that the child is not a boy.

b . [Kono-ko ga otoko-dat-tara] yokatta-noni / yokatta-N-dakedo.
 a boy be-Past-if (based on Akatsuka 1985 : 627)

lit. " If this child had been a boy, it would have been good. "

i) Speaker regretted that the child is not a boy.

In Japanese, it is to be noted that the utterance time is the time of view point, and it decides the tense of the sentence. Therefore, different from cases where the Present is involved, the WISH construction expresses counterfactuality irrespective of the tenses of the *P*. *Yokatta-noni / yokatta-N-dakedo* in(15)and(16)are uttered when what is described in the *P* is not realized. It is clearly the expression of the speaker's regret that what(s)he WANTED IT TO HAPPEN did not happen.

Finally we will look into the Korean WISH .(17) , (18)and(19)below are the Past of

(9), (10) and (11) :

- (17) [K] a . Na-nun [Meri-ga phati-ey o-myen] he-sseu-yo.
 I-Top Mary-NOM party-to come-Present-if wish-Past-Ind

lit. I wished Mary came to the party.

i) Speaker regretted that Mary did not go to the party.

- b . Na-nun [Meri-ga phati-ey wa-sseu-myen] he-sseu-yo.
 come-Past-if wish-Past-Ind

lit. I wished Mary came to the party.

i) Speaker regretted that Mary did not go to the party.

(Jang and Lee 1999 : 3)

- (18) [K] a . Na-nun [Meri-do kachi phati-ey ka-myen] choat-nunde⁽⁹⁾.
 I-Top Mary-NOM-also together party-to go-Present-if wish-Past-Ind

lit. I wished Mary could go to the party.

i) Speaker regretted that Mary did not go to the party.

- b . Na-nun [Meri-do kachi phati-ey ka-ssu-myen] choat-nunde.
 go-Past-if

lit. I wished Mary could go to the party.

i) Speaker regretted that Mary did not go to the party.

Last of all we turn to now the familiar baby-boy story :

- (19) [K] a . Na-nun [i-ai-ga adul-i-myen] he-ssu-yo / choat-nunde..
 I-Top this child-NOM a boy-be-Present-if wish-Past-Ind

lit. I wished this baby was a boy..

i) Speaker regretted that her baby is(was) a girl.

- b . Na-nun [i-ai-ga adul-yetsu-myen] he-ssu-yo / choat-nunde.
 I-Top this child-NOM a boy-be-Past-if wish-Past-Ind

lit. I wished this baby was a boy..

i) Speaker regretted that her baby is(was) a girl.

In (17), (18) and (19), exactly the same result with that of Japanese can be observed. They are the expression of the speakers' regretful comment that what they wanted did not happen. Therefore, they are counterfactual. Also they show that the tense in the *P* can be the Present and Past.

We sum up features of verbal morphologies in the *P*, and counterfactuality of each sen-

tence in (20) : .

- (20) Comparison of the three languages when the tense of the *Q* is the Past.

Language	WISH construction	Morphologies in the <i>P</i>	Event time in the <i>P</i>	counterfactual
English	wished <i>P</i>	* V-present	*	yes
		V-past	past	
		had V-en	past	
Japanese	<i>P nara yokattanoni</i>	V-present	past	yes
		V-past	past	
Korean	<i>P myen he-sseu-yo</i>	V-present	past	yes
		V-past	past	

3. Tense system and Counterfactuality

We will explain where the differences above come from. We start from considering the following sentences in(21) :

- (21) [E] a . The train left before I reached the station . (Matsumura 1996 : 8)

[J] b . Watashi-ga eki-ni tsuku-mae-ni kisha-wa dete-simatta.

I-NOM station-to arrive-Present-before, train-NOM leave-Past

We notice that there is a difference of tense morphologies between(21a)and(21b). That is in (21a), there is tense agreement between the matrix and embedded clauses, but it is not the case in(21b). This comes from the difference of reference time between the two languages. English follows“ absolute tense ”where the deictic center is the utterance time, but Japanese takes“ relative tense ” where the reference point is given by the context. Therefore, tense morphologies in embedded clauses play a different function from that of the main clause in Japanese⁽¹⁰⁾. In(21a) “ the event that the speaker reaches the station ” is understood to have taken place in the past when seen from the reference time. In (21b), on the other hand, “ the event that the speaker reaches the station ” is understood to take place later than the time of the main clause, and so the tense is not the Past, but the Present⁽¹¹⁾. We show the case of(21) in a chart(22) :

- (22) Reference time in English and Japanese in(21)

	Time system	Referenc time	Event time
English	absolute	utterance time	Past
Japanese	relative	context dependent	Present

In this connection let us see the behavior of the WISH construction above. In Japanese we have observed that the tense in the *P* can be either the Present or the Past regardless of that of the *Q*. This is simply because the language follows“ relative tense ” and has a different reference time from that of English. If the event of the reference time represents the Future, the future event belongs to the Irrealis domain in the sense of Akatsuka(1985). She later defines

the concept as the subjective non-fact world in Akatsuka(1996:4). It is clear that the future event is non-fact and so uncertain. Thus the attitude of uncertainty certainly carries the Irrealis feature⁽¹²⁾. It is here that the concept Desirability she introduced in(1996:16) plays an important role in interpreting the WISH construction. In terms of the Desirability the construction represents mental attitude of the speaker that the *P* is what(s)he-wants-it-to-happen. We have observed in(13)and(20)that counterfactuality occurs when the Event time is either the Present or the Past. So naturally the speaker is aware that the content of the *P* belongs to the Realis. Then we can assume that it represents the mental attitude of the speaker that the *P* is what the (s)he doesn't-want-it-to-happen. Therefore, as we have shown above, the implication sentences carry says "The speaker regretted what is stated in the *P*." Therefore we argue that the concept of Desirability/unDesirability in conditionals be mentioned in the WISH construction, too.

As for counterfactuality, Jang and Lee(1999) argues that counterfactuality is context dependent and therefore an instance of a conversational implicature⁽¹³⁾ in the sense of Grice(1975). We have seen that the context suggests whether the Event time is future or not. This is made possible when the relative tense system allows us to use different tense system from that of English. Therefore, we support Akatsuka(1996:46)'s argument that the counterfactuality belongs to the domain of cognitive concept and that it cannot be explained by virtue of grammatical schema only.

Now we will turn to Korean. We have shown in section 2 that Korean WISH construction bears the identical result with that of Japanese in that i) morphological features of the verb and AP in the *P* is different from that of the *Q*, and that what is stated in the *P* has no counterfactual implication when the event in the *P* signifies Future. Under such circumstances, we can safely conclude that Korean also has the "relative tense", and so counterfactuality can best be explained when the Desirability in Akatsuka(1996) is an important concept in the interpretation of the WISH construction.

4. Conclusion

We have shown in this paper that Japanese and Korean WISH constructions share a few commonalities and make a clear distinction from that of English. The characteristic of English WISH construction is that it has a counterfactual reading regardless of tenses of the main clauses. But it is not the case with Japanese and Korean. First, there is a correspondence in their verbal morphologies in the *P*. To be more exact, the verbal morphologies can be either the Present or the Past regardless of the tense in the *Q*. Secondly, counterfactuality does not appear when the event time in the *P* signifies the Future. Thirdly, we have shown that the occurrence and non-occurrence of counterfactuality stem from the "relative tense" system in Japanese. The exact correspondence of Korean with Japanese with respect to these points suggests that Korean, too, adopts the same "relative tense" system with Japanese. Thus Desirability in Akatsuka(1996) plays an important role in Japanese and Korean WISH construction. At the same time the results shown in this paper lends us some evidence that contrastive study of languages leads to the discovery of some common features among languages.

Footnotes :

- (1) See Kim, Fun Gyu et al. (1997:24) for more details.
- (2) We capitalize the tense form simply for convenience.
- (3) Jang and Lee(1999:3) points out that Han(1996) claimed that Korean does not have a lexical item which corresponds to English *wish*.
- (4) See Machida(1989) for more details.
- (5) *Ha-ta* example is provided by Jang and Lee(1999:3).
- (6) It is to be noted that *palay-ta* can serve as a WISH-construction. It is *want*-type and takes the form of gerunds. See Jang and Lee(1999) for more details.
- (7) One out of six Korean subjects says that the sentence can be counterfactual as well.
- (8) See for details *Korean Conversation* V 2(1997:24)
- (9) "-nunde" is a predicative ending, similar to that of Japanese, "... yokatta-N-dakedo."
- (10) See Machida(1989:54) for details.
- (11) See Matsumura(1996:8-9).
- (12) Lee, Chang-Bong(1997) claims that *-myen* carries irrealis feature inherently.
- (13) A conversational implicature is characterized as cancellability and context dependent. See Jang and Lee(1999:4) for more details.

References

- Adger, D. and J. Quer. 1996. Subjunctives, Unselected Embedded Questions, and Clausal Polarity Items. *Proceedings of the North East Linguistic Society*. 27: 1-16.
- Akatsuka, N. 1985. Conditionals and the Epistemic Scale, *Language* 61.3
- Akatsuka, N. 1986. Conditionals are Discourse-bound. *On Conditionals*. ed. by Traugott, E. A. Meulen, J. Reilly and C. Ferguson. Cambridge University Press. 1-16.
- Akatsuka, N. 1992. Japanese Modals are Conditionals. *The Joy of Grammar: A Festschrift for James D. McCawley*, ed. by D. Brentari et al.: 1-10. Amsterdam. John Benjamins.
- Akatsuka, N. and P. Clancy. 1993. Conditionality and Deontic Modality in Japanese and Korean; Evidence from the Emergence of Conditionals. *Japanese / Korean Linguistics*. V.2. 177-192.
- Akatsuka, N. and A. Tsubomoto 1998. *Modality to Hatsuwa Koui*, Nichieigo Hikaku Sennsho, V.3. edit. by Minoru Nakau, pp.2-94. Kennkyuusha.
- Egawa, T. 1977. *A New Guide to English Grammar*, Kaneko Shobou.
- Erteschik-Shir, N. 1977, On the Nature of Island Constraints. Ph.D. dissertation, MIT.
- Ferguson, C., A. Meulen, J. Reilly and E. Traugott. 1986. Overview. *On Conditionals*, ed. by Traugott, E. A. Meulen, J. Reilly and C. Ferguson. 3-20. Cambridge University Press.
- Grice, P. 1975. Logic and Conversation. *Syntax and Semantics*. V3: 41-58.
- Jang, Y and K. Lee. 1999. Counterfactual wish-Constructions in English and Korean. 1-11. 6th Summer Institute of Linguistics / TACL. Sophia Univ. / Sept.12
- Kim, Fun Gyu et al. (1997) *Korean Conversation*, v.2, Seoul, Kode Minjok Munpha Yonguso (Korean Culture Research Center).
- Kudoh, M. 1995. *Aspect · Tense Taikei to Text*. Hitsuji Shobou.
- Kuno, S. 1973. *The Structure of the Japanese Language*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Lee, Chang-Bong. 1997. The Discourse Function of the *-myen* Clause in Korean. *Japanese and Korean Linguistics*.

Contrastive Study of the WISH Construction in English, Japanese and Korean

V.6. 695-714. Stanford : CSLI.

Machida, K. 1989. *Nihonngono Jisei to Aspect (Tense and Aspect in Japanese)*, Aruku Shobou.

Matsumura, Y. 1996. *Nichieigono jisei to sou (Tense and Aspect in Japanese)*, Kaibunsha.

Mayes, P.1996. The Complementary Functions of *Tara* and *To* : Evidence from Procedural / Instructional Discourse. *Japanese Korean Linguistics*, ed. By Akatsuka, Iwasaki and Strauss. V.5. 101-113. Stanford : CSLI.

Mihara, K. 1992. *Jisei Kaishaku to Tougo Genshoh*. Kuroshio Shuppan.

Morishita, K. and K.Chi. 1992. *Nichi • Kango Taisho : Genngogaku Nyuumon*. Hakuteisha.

Ohta, K. 1997. Tense in the Subject Raising Construction. *Japanese / Korean Linguistics*. V6. 353-368. Stanford : CSLI.

Reilly, J. 1986. The Acquisition of Temporals and Conditionals. *On Conditionals*, ed. by Traugott, E. A. Meulen, J. Reilly and C. Ferguson. 309-331. Cambridge University Press.

Schutze, C. 2001. On Korean "Case Stacking" : The Varied Functions of the Particles *ka* and *lul*. *Linguistic Review*. V.18. No.3. 193-232.

Shi, Chung-Kon. 1997. Two Types of Synthetic Compounds and Move-Affix in Korean. *Japanese / Korean Linguistics*. V6. 369-380. Stanford : CSLI

Teramura, H. 1984. *Nihonngono Syntax to Imi (Japanese Syntax and Meaning)*. Kuroshio Shuppan.

Yamaguchi Fujii, S. 1993. On the Clause-Linking to Construction in Japanese. *Japanese / Korean Linguistics*. V2. 3-19. Stanford : CSLI.

Appreciation :

Many thanks go to Mr.Kelly Quinn, professor at Nagoya Women's University(NWU), for his kindness and patience in correcting and improving my paper. I am also grateful to Prof. Nobuo Suyama, Prof. Sonhi Pak, part time Korean teachers at NWU, and four other Korean friends, for their advice in checking Korean sentences, and to five NWU students who willingly served as my subjects. Needless to say, all remaining errors are my own.